

14 NOV 1979

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Personnel

FROM : Bruce C. Clarke
Director
National Foreign Assessment Center

SUBJECT : NAPA Project Group Report

1. The NAPA Project Group, in my view, has performed extremely well. The report is lucid and, given the number of subjects to cover, not unreasonably long. The recommendations are rational, and I can, with but a few exceptions, support the findings.

2. I have attached a list which gives an NFAC opinion on the recommendations of each Tab in order. I have indicated my view of each specific recommendation using a scale of Strongly Reject, Reject, Moot, Acceptable, Endorse, and Strongly Endorse. I have no Strongly Reject items and only a few Reject items.

3. I add my concern and support to the issue of excessive employee expectations as described in paragraphs 5-7 of the memorandum of the Project Group to you dated 2 November. NFAC managers strongly believe that, beginning with Mr. Colby's directorship and continuing almost in an unbroken line, Agency management--though acting in a rational manner--has created the belief on the part of a large number of employees that advancement opportunities are essentially unlimited. We collectively opine that this overly-optimistic view raises false hope, as reality stands in the way of achievement of these unrealistic expectations. I add my support to the recommendation in paragraph 7 of the aforementioned memorandum. I do not believe that the extent of these unrealistic expectations is exaggerated, and I do believe that these expectations are responsible for a significant proportion of Agency personnel problems.

4. I strongly support a basic theme in the NAPA paper and in the NAPA study that responsibility for getting the work of the Agency done and authority for personnel management should rest in the same hands. NFAC's strongest support for specific recommendations concerns those recommendations which move towards keeping the one who is responsible for work also responsible for personnel matters. Our support is weakest in those areas where centralization is implied or where the authority of the supervisor is diminished.

SECRET

Approved For Release 2001/11/08 : CIA-RDP89-01114R000300030024-5

SUBJECT: NAPA Project Group Report

5. From the point of view of the number of employees directly affected, I believe that Tab J--Vacancy Notices, Tab K--College Degrees for Professional Positions, Tab N--Competitive Evaluation Panels, Tab O--Decision Role of Panels, Tab P--Evaluation Panel Functions, Tab S--Flow Through Policy, Tab U--The 3% Concept, and Tab W--Agency Obligation to Employees, are the most important. I support all but one of the recommendations on these Tabs with only minor comments.

6. I recognize that acceptance of these recommendations will impose some procedural changes in NFAC, will require some actions by myself, and will impose considerable additional workload on OP. Nevertheless, I believe general acceptance of these proposals will effectively strengthen personnel management within CIA. The recommendations will allow sufficient flexibility to reflect the varied professions represented within the Agency and the various conditions faced by the Agency, and should clarify misconceptions apparently held by large numbers of Agency employees.

7. Please note that I do not think that the 70 recommendations even when fully implemented will be a panacea. Employee-held misconceptions will remain because some people are ineffective listeners and because the system is not, nor should it be, simple. I also recognize that fulfillment of all of the recommendations herein listed will require some years to implement effectively and uniformly throughout the Agency. I would, consequently, urge that notices to Agency employees on these recommendations recognize that the changes involved cannot and will not immediately alter their lives. They will be effective only over a period of some years.



25X1A

Bruce C. Clarke

Attachment:
as stated

Original DDPers/P+C-15 Mar 1979

Approved For Release 2001/11/08 : CIA-RDP89-01114R000300030024-5

SECRET

NFAC OPINION ON RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE
NAPA PROJECT GROUP REPORT

Tab A	Rec. A - moot Rec. B - moot Rec. C - strongly endorse	Law on CIA personnel system
Tab B	Rec. A - reject NOTE: NFAC opines that a written set of considerations for use in determining whether or not to adopt changes which stem from systems in other agencies is desirable. Rec. B - acceptable Rec. C - acceptable	Record of change in personnel policy (DDCI-D/OP problem)
Tab C	Rec. A - acceptable Rec. B - acceptable	DCI approval of personnel policy
Tab D	Rec. - acceptable NOTE: Minority View--A portion of NFAC management strongly believes that for policy purposes D/OP should report directly to the DCI or DDCI.	DCI emphasize control & enforcement of OP
Tab E	Rec. A - endorse Rec. B - endorse	Component personnel officer role
Tab F	Rec. - moot	OP operations focal point (OP concerns)
Tab G	Rec. - reject NOTE: NFAC believes that we can identify several operational activities performed in the recruitment division that would be better and more expeditiously performed in the directorate and offices. For example, invitations for pre-processing interviews; immediate initiation of processing on urgent applications, flexibility to select in-grade hire salaries in lieu of higher grade.	Further decentralized OP operations (the subject was ill-defined by the NAPA study and the NAPA Project Group Report had difficulties)

Tab H Rec. - endorse E Career Service

Tab I Rec. A - endorse CT recruitment
Rec. B - acceptable
Rec. C - endorse
Rec. D - moot
Rec. E - moot

Tab J Rec. A - endorse Vacancy Notices
Rec. B - reject

NOTE: We believe that the cost of the annual report of anticipated vacancies and the centralized repositories of vacancy notices will cost more than the benefit derived. We also share the other concerns in the discussion in paragraph I starting on page J-15.

Rec. C - endorse if
B is implemented
Rec. D - moot
Rec. E - strongly endorse

NOTE: While strongly endorsing this recommendation, we believe that the first ticked item, "no qualified candidate in the component" should be changed to read "no exceptionally qualified candidate in the component."

Rec. F - strongly endorse
Rec. G - endorse
Rec. H - reject

NOTE: NFAC would strongly endorse if D/OP reviewed rather than approved all directorate issuances and brought major differences to the DDCI.

Rec. I - endorse

Tab K Rec. A - endorse College degree for professional
Rec. B - endorse positions

Tab L Rec. A - endorse Agency-wide sub-groups for
Rec. B - endorse occupational series
Rec. C - strongly endorse

Tab M Rec. A - acceptable Rotational assignments policy

NOTE: NFAC could strongly endorse if the statement were ended at the end of the second line, i.e., period after "basic policy statement." The rest of the statement argues for a specific policy.

Rec. B - moot

NOTE: We could strongly endorse this recommendation if the text included "needs of the Agency to staff functions" as a significant factor affecting rotational assignments.

Tab N Rec. A - endorse Competitive evaluation panels
Rec. B - endorse
Rec. C - endorse

NOTE: Minority View--A portion of NFAC management does not wish to eliminate competitive evaluation promotion panels for those grades below journeyman. NFAC could strongly endorse if the words "the requirement for" were inserted between "Eliminate" and "competitive."

Rec. D - endorse

Tab O Rec. A - strongly endorse Decision role of panels
Rec. B - acceptable

Tab P Rec. A - strongly endorse Evaluation panel function
Rec. B - strongly endorse
Rec. C - endorse
Rec. D - strongly endorse

Tab Q Rec. - endorse Uniform precepts for panels

Tab R Rec. A - acceptable Labeling positions as professional
Rec. B - acceptable and clerical

NOTE: The recommendation would be improved by adding OP to OTR for action.

Tab S Rec. A - strongly endorse Flow-through policy
 Rec. B - acceptable
 Rec. C - reject

NOTE: NFAC could endorse if the first sentence ended with the words "balanced work force." The remainder of the sentence in context adds to the notion that a "flow-through" system is in operation and adds to the excessive expectations about advancement by many CIA employees.

Rec. D - strongly endorse

Tab T Rec. A - strongly endorse Personnel reduction
 Rec. B - moot

Tab U Rec. A - strongly endorse 3% concept
 Rec. B - strongly endorse

Tab V Rec. A - strongly endorse Non-competitive transfers
 Rec. B - endorse

NOTE: NFAC could strongly endorse if Rec. B instructed OP to achieve transferability.

Tab W Rec. A - endorse
 Rec. B - endorse

NOTE: The Civil Service Reform Act provides for re-training of the kinds of people talked about in this recommendation in order to permit their movement within the Government or to an outside job. The Agency, consequently, could go further than it presently does in providing similar assistance to persons who become surplus through technological change, elimination of programs, or like developments.

Tab X Rec. A - acceptable Personnel management evaluation
 Rec. B - acceptable program

Tab Y Rec. A - acceptable Costs of personnel administration

Tab Z Rec. A - endorse PRA

NOTE: Minority View--A portion of NFAC management would eliminate all PRAs.

Rec. B - acceptable

Tab AA Rec. A - acceptable Returning LWOP rights
 Rec. B - moot

NOTE: Irrelevant. A 19 October memorandum from the ADDA to the four DDs has already been approved and modifies Agency policy as recommended in Rec. B.